Item 1: Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)
Description: Review and approval of minutes from 10-22-15 meeting.

No changes. Minutes from 10/22 approved.

Item 2: IT Trends / Innovative Activity (10 Minutes)
Description: Interesting topics from the field;
Activity from your unit that would be of interest to the group

Henrik: Chrome discontinuing support for Windows XP, Vista, and early versions of OSX in April of 2016.

Willis: Oracle posted a vulnerability with some Java code that allows remote code execution without a password.

Cheryl: Partnering with students to work on creating a new facility. Would like to see more opportunities similar to this.

?: Would like to get a group of people together in order to select university wide mentorship software.
?: University mobile apps contract expires in April of 2016. Need system wide contract. Create a steering committee before December to begin discussing options.

?: Dell One Identity project is scheduled to be rolled out by December, currently finishing up final testing and adjustments.

Henrik and Ed: Outlook crashes on Windows 10 when loading graphics files. Currently no patch has been released. Only way around the issue is to go back to the previous version.

?: Timeline for migrating Exchange 2010 to Exchange 2013. One department has already migrated, should start seeing more migration by the start of 2016.

**Item 3: Announcements (10 minutes)**

**Description:** Update to TAMU Exchange address book formatting issue   (Cheryl Cato)

Work done in order to change Exchange. Change needs to be made at Gateway. Least disruptive option is to modify Gateway and put an option for Exchange only. This results in an extra step, but it constrains the process to exchange only. There has been some push back on Last Name, First Name option. Dell One Identity is right around the corner, looking at options to make the process better. Would like to put a hold on the change in Gateway to see what Dell One Identity brings. Start changes in the Spring. Dell One Identity is much more flexible in what it’s able to do. However, if it doesn’t look good, can still modify Gateway in the spring. Move some functionality in the IT Pro app to Gateway. Whatever is changed in Gateway will be reflected in the IT Pro app. Implementation will be in the Spring, either for Dell One Identity or for Gateway.

Data center reboot broke personal best records in getting out in less than 5 days. With current schedule, data center won’t be complete until April. Currently investigating other options and getting alternate bids with a much faster completion date. Will go to Board of Regents in February for final approval.

Infoblox project is currently being reviewed.

Regarding WebEx, still no solution to the problem of toll and toll free calling. Possibly end beta by the end of the year and formally announce and roll it out. If Cisco can’t fix toll and toll free issues, just use VOIP option and make exceptions for people that requested long distance. Billing goes out by department. Officially rolling out at the start of 2016. Has been used in College of Architecture and worked really well. Most people using VOIP option which is no charge. Set default option to VOIP and allow those that need to call to do so. Working on an operation guide for every department. Cheryl will send URLs to anyone who wants to begin using WebEx.

**Item 4: IT Accessibility (20 minutes)**

**Description:** Introduction and vision (Cynthia Kauder)

Accessibility is an important issue that needs to be discussed. There are federal and state mandates that require resources to be accessible to everyone, regardless of disabilities. A main problem right now is the lack of consistent message from administration. Many colleges aren’t aware of what the actual regulations are regarding accessibility. The conversation about accessibility tends to get stalled across IT and Instructional Technology. Concerned parties need to come together and have a discussion about the best practices and to construct a model of funding. Everyone knows about the importance of accessibility options, but actually doing something about it and paying for it is a completely different issue. ITC has been discussing it for a long time. There isn’t currently a standard, and every college is simply doing their own thing. Need to change processes so that accessibility is built in all across campus. There are a wide array of different accessibility products available. When current websites
are created, they need to be developed with every user in mind, including those with disabilities. Not only is this the law, but also a civil right. Doing so would help A&M with its mission, and it’s also a moral obligation. For Texas, the state laws are found in Texas Administrative Code (TAC) 206 and TAC 213. Would be a good idea to follow WCAG 2.0 guidelines and strive for Grade 2 compliance. The main issue now is the cost of redesigning all of the current systems to make them accessible to everyone. If a product is designed from the start to be accessible, the cost is very little. However, if the product needs to be redeveloped to be accessible after it has already been completed, the cost becomes quite a lot. In the current situation, there is a lot that needs to be redesigned and the cost is too great to do much. There are testing tools available and being used to give a ‘grade’ to each department regarding the content they have accessible. However, automated testing tools only find about 25% of accessibility errors. Hoping to get liaisons in each college to get out all of the information regarding accessibility.

Regarding captioning. For now, need to find immediate needs and see if a plan can be put into place to get captioning for course content for a certain period of time, then move forward from there. There are thousands of hours of supplementary instruction that all needs captioning. ITAC conference in February will discuss the issues at greater length.

To summarize, there are a lot of issues regarding accessibility that need to be addressed, but finding the funding to take care of everything is a problem of its own. For now, a plan needs to be created to address the content that needs to be made accessible first, then move on from there.

**Item 5: Information Systems Recovery and Reconstitution (40 minutes)**

Description: Information on university-level initiative for ISRR (formerly Disaster Recovery) and discussion (Willis Marti)

The end goal for the program is a single recovery plan for the university, not multiple plans for recovery. Currently, there is very little consistency in documented plans. There needs to be a plan in place to facilitate the coordination across multiple colleges when a disaster occurs. Last year there was a system audit on disaster recovery, and there are new laws and regulations about recovery in Texas (TAC 202). There are certain departments that need to still be able to operate even when disaster strikes, and there are certain critical functions that need to be prevented from ever going down. For example, UPD and Utilities and Energy Services both have critical functions that should have as little downtime as possible. Need to start thinking about how long a process could be unavailable, and how quickly certain processes could be recovered. Operations like power and cold water should always be available, and operations like internet and communication should have very little down time. IT and other departments need to have a plan for operating when certain disasters strike, instead of having to make a last minute plan when something does eventually go wrong. Would like to work on how we can provide support to organizations that are thinking about ISRR. The organizations can create plans on their own, but the final decisions regarding recovery must be approved by the President and Vice President. During the initial phase, critical infrastructure will be the focus. Most of the decision making isn’t ITAC’s responsibility, but needs to be discussed with the head of each specific organization. Ideally need to provide each dean a list of the length of time a process can be allowed to go down. Still really early in the decision making process, but ITAC needs to be aware that the process is going on.

**Item 6: Open Discussion (5 minutes)**

No discussion. Meeting adjourned at 10:02.